



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

COMMUNICATION

Editor of the School Review:

As a rule, no good comes of "post mortem" discussions about book reviews. But I am moved to ask your indulgence for a brief reply to Professor Fling's strictures on my review of Langlois and Seignobos. My respect for his judgment is such that I should be pre-disposed to yield my own opinion about most matters in case of a disagreement. But in this matter I cannot think he is right, for the following reasons:

1. A re-reading of the authors' preface confirms my previous judgment regarding the attitude of the authors to their predecessors. Whether deserved or not, such sweeping and contemptuous language toward historians of the first rank, such a tone of undisguised superiority, is irritating to a degree, even in such undeniably superior persons as MM. Langlois et Seignobos.

2. The review quoted in the footnote on page 5 contains the substance of all that the authors have to say about Freeman; this is all that I stated.

3. In support of the criticism that history is treated from the subjective standpoint, I call attention to the note on pages 46-7, wherein geography is denied the position of a science auxiliary to history. Surely, if there is anything established beyond cavil, it is that geography is the one main science auxiliary to history, so soon as history is interpreted to mean something more than comparing documents. Chapter IV of Book III, to which Professor Fling refers, offers no refutation of this charge. The literary point of view still prevails.

4. The exclusion of the books mentioned cannot be excused on the ground that Bernheim also excluded them, for the simple reason that many of them had not then appeared. They certainly belong in the work as much as others which are mentioned.

In conclusion permit me to say that I believe Professor Fling's fears that any reader of the review would be deterred from using the book are entirely unfounded, and I hope that exactly the opposite effect would follow.

EDWARD VAN DYKE ROBINSON

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL,
St. Paul, Minn.